DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 291 032 CG 020 564

AUTHOR Korabik, Karen; Ayman, Roya
TITLE Androgyny and Leadership Style: Toward a Conceptual Synthesis.
PUB DATE 31 Aug 87
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (95th, New York, NY, August 28-September 1, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrators; *Androgyny; Foreign Countries; *Leadership Qualities; Leadership Styles; *Managerial Occupations; *Personality Traits; *Sex Differences; *Sex Role; Sexual Identity
IDENTIFIERS Canada

ABSTRACT

Although the idea of androgynous leadership has been discussed frequently in the management literature, little empirical evidence has been accumulated to support a conceptual integration. Results of preliminary research support the hypothesis that sex-role orientation is a better predictor of leadership behavior than is biological sex. This study was conducted to replicate the results of previous research using actual managers as subjects, to extend the proposed conceptual model by incorporating other variables relevant to managerial leadership which also pertain to the dimensions of instrumentality and expressiveness, and to examine the relationship between sex-role orientation and self-perceptions of managerial effectiveness. Male (N=121) and female (N=126) middle to upper level managers completed the Bem Sex Role Inventory; the Job Description Index; a job stress scale; and adaptations of the Ohio State Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire, the Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Resolution Scale, and the Profile of Organizational Influence Strategies. Subjects rated their leadership effectiveness, how good a manager they were, and how well their subordinates performed. The results strongly support the contention that biological sex is not an important factor in determining managerial style. They provide empirical evidence for a conceptual synthesis of androgyny, leadership, and conflict resolution theories. (NB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED291032

Androgyny and Leadership Style: Toward a Conceptual Synthesis

Karen Korabik

University of Guelph

and

Roya Ayman

Illinois Institute of Technology

CG 020564

Requests for reprints should be sent to:

Dr. Karen Korabik
Department of Psychology
University of Guelph
Guelph, Ontario N1G 2W1

A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, New York, New York, August 31, 1987.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Karen Korabik

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

An article by Sampson (1977) initially provoked our interest in the idea of androgynous leadership. In this article Sampson drew a contrast between Bem's theory of androgyny and Bales' theory of leadership, pointing out that the former takes an individualistic approach, whereas the emphasis of the latter theory is collectivistic. Because Roya and I have backgrounds in both personality and applied social psychology, what struck us was not the differences between these two theoretical perspectives, but rather their similarities. Both are dialectical models based on the synthesis of the same two underlying dimensions- instrumentality and expressiveness.

Bem (1974) sees the integration of these dimensions as taking place within the individual personality with the proportional representation of traits on each dimension representing the degree to which a person is sex-typed. Bales (1951), on the other hand, is interested in the representation of instrumental and expressive attributes within the small group and with the subsequent effects on group functioning. A small group, however, is composed of individual personalities and whether certain characteristics will be expressed in the group is a function of whether they exist in the individual members. Persons who have been socialized to possess instrumental or expressive qualities will be likely to adopt either instrumental or expressive roles in group settings. Thus, if one takes an interactionist perspective, one would expect the concepts of androgyny and leadership style to be conceptually related.

Although the idea of androgynous leadership has been discussed frequently in the management literature and has seemingly gained widespread acceptance (Bolton & Humphreys, 1977; Sargent, 1981), little empirical evidence has been accumulated to support a conceptual integration. Most of the research on this topic has centered instead on the perceptions (Arkkelin

& Simmons, 1985; Powell & Butterfield, 1979, 1984), the task performance (Motowildo, 1982; Muldrow & Bayton, 1979), or the effectiveness (Baril, Elbert & Mahar-Potter, 1987) of androgynous managers.

Our research has attempted to address this gap by establishing the nature of the empirical relationship between sex-role orientation and the use of task- versus social-emotional leadership styles. In preliminary work done in the laboratory with undergraduate psychology students as subjects, we found (Korabik, 1982a) masculinity to be significantly correlated with the reported use of an initiating structure style of leadership and femininity to be significantly related to reported use of consideration. Furthermore, androgyny was significantly related to both initiating structure and to consideration. In addition, multiple regression analyses demonstrated that sex-role orientation was a better predictor of leadership style than was biological sex.

In further studies (Korabik, 1981, 1982b) the actual behavior of subjects in small groups was examined using Bales' (1951) Interaction Process Analysis. The results of these studies demonstrated that masculine individuals of both sexes preferred the task-oriented leadership role to the social-emotional role. Similarly, feminine individuals of both sexes preferred the social-emotional role to the task-oriented role. In addition, androgynous individuals were found to be capable of adopting either the task-oriented or the social-emotional leadership role and would chose to perform whatever role was not already represented in the group (i.e., they would display social-emotional leadership with masculine partners and task-oriented leadership with feminine partners regardless of their partners' gender).

The results of these studies support the hypothesis that sex-role

orientation is a better predictor of leadership behavior than is biological sex. Furthermore, they attest to the utility of a synthesis of the theoretical perspectives on androgyny and leadership. They are, however, limited due to the restricted subject population used. The purpose of this study was to replicate the results of previous research using actual managers.

Additionally, this study attempted to extend the proposed conceptual model by incorporating other variables relevant to managerial leadership which also pertain to the dimensions of instrumentality and expressiveness. One such variable is conflict resolution style. Blake and Mouton (1978) have proposed a two dimensional model where one dimension indexes "concern for people" and the other indexes "concern for production". A similar model has been suggested by Thomas (1976). He postulates five conflict management styles- avoidance, competition, compromise, accommodation and collaboration (see Figure 1) which fall along the two dimensions of assertiveness or concern for oneself and cooperation or concern for the other party. On the basis of such theories one would hypothesize a relationship between masculinity and the use of a style of conflict management like competition which is high in assertiveness. Likewise, femininity would be expected to be related to the use of a style such as accommodation which is high in concern for others and androgyny should correspond to a collaborative style.

---

insert Figure 1 about here

There is little empirical evidence in support of this conception because research on conflict resolution styles has focused on sex rather than on sex-role as a mediating variable. Thus, while one study found no

differences between male and female managers (Shockley-Zalabak, 1981), others have found men to be more competitive than women (Kilmann & Thomas, 1977) and women to be more compromising (Kilmann & Thomas, 1977; Rahim, 1983), avoiding, integrating and less obliging (accommodating) than men (Rahim, 1983). The differences in the results of these studies may be due to the different methodologies they used or to the fact that because sex and sex-role may covary in some samples, sex-role orientation may be acting as a confounding variable.

Another area of leadership which has been studied from the perspective of personal style is the manner in which managers use power to influence their superiors, co-workers and subordinates (Kipnis, Schmidt & Wilkinson, 1980). It is more difficult to fit this research into the theoretical framework which has been presented thus far because Kipnis and his associates have deliberately used an inductive approach in their investigations. However, some of the influence strategies which have been postulated appear as if they might be related to instrumentality (i.e., rationality and assertiveness) or to expressiveness (i.e., ingratiation or friendliness, exchange of benefits and coalition). This study sought to explore whether in fact this was the case.

A final purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between sex-role orientation and self-perceptions of managerial effectiveness. Models of sex-role orientation (Bem, 1974), leadership style (Fleishman, 1973) and conflict management (Blake & Mouton, 1978) all predict that the most effective person will be someone who is high in both instrumentality and expressiveness.

Method

Subjects. The subjects were 222 female middle to upper level managers

in a large public utility company and two insurance companies and an equal number of males matched to them for job position and tenure.

Procedure. Subjects were sent a questionnaire through the mail. Among other measures it consisted of (see Table 1):

1) the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI; Bem, 1974).

2) an adaptation of the Ohio State Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ; Stogdill & Coons, 1957). This scale measures two categories of leadership- initiating structure and consideration- which correspond to task-oriented and social-emotional leadership as defined by Bales. The LBDQ was modified so as to make each statement into a self-referent (e.g., "he makes his attitudes clear to the staff" was changed to "I make my attitudes clear to the staff"). This also had the effect of removing the masculinity bias inherent in the original wording.

3) an adaptation of the Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Resolution Scale (T-K; Thomas & Kilmann, 1974). This is an ipsative instrument which pairs each style of conflict resolution with every other style. For the purpose of this study 15 items (three representing each of the five styles) were transformed into four point Likert scales.

4) a 27 item adaptation of the Profile of Organizational Influence Strategies (POIS; Hinkin & Schriesheim, 1986).

5) the Job Description Index, a measure of job satisfaction (JDI; Smith, Kendall & Hulin, 1969) and

6) a job stress scale (Chemers, Hays, Rhodewalt & Wysocki, 1985).

---

insert Table 1 about here

In addition, subjects were asked to rate on five point Likert scales:

1) their effectiveness as a leader, 2) how good a manager they were, and 3) how well their subordinates performed as a group. They were also asked how many promotions and organizational rewards (i.e, raises, bonuses, citations, etc.) they had received since January, 1980.

Results

Fifty-six percent of the questionnaires were returned for a sample size of 121 males and 126 females. The subjects were primarily section managers (n = 205), with the remainder being operations managers or directors. They ranged in age from 26 to 59 (M = 42) and had an average of 13.8 years experience in management. Although males and females did not differ in amount of managerial experience, $p > .05$, males had spent more years with their companies, t (234) = 2.65, $p < .01$, and more years in their present positions, t (240) = 3.11, $p < .01$, than females (see Table 2). Male managers had more male subordinates than female managers did, t (238) = 3.12, $p < .01$, and female managers had more female subordinates than male managers did, t (237) = -2.25, $p < .05$.

The median for masculinity was 5.4 and that for femininity was 4.65. Females were higher in femininity than males, t (242) = 3.06, $p < .01$. There were no sex differences on masculinity, $p > .05$, but the entire sample was skewed in the direction of high masculinity.

---

insert Table 2 about here

All scales except the POIS were subjected to dual scaling (Nishisato, 1980) prior to further analysis. The POIS was factor analyzed as suggested by Hinkin and Schriesheim (1986). The best solution consisted of four factors (I. Ingratiation and exchange; II. Assertiveness and upward appeal;

III. Coalition; and IV. Rationality) and explained 45% of the variance. Since this analysis essentially confirmed the dimensions suggested by Kipnis et. al. (1980), all six subscales were used in further analysis.

Correlations. As expected masculinity was positively and significantly correlated with (see Table 3) structure, competition, assertiveness and rationality. In addition, although no specific predictions had been made about the relationships between masculinity and avoidance, accommodation and collaboration, the obtained correlations are not inconsistent with the theoretical perspective which has been presented.

---

insert Table 3 about here

As expected femininity was positively and significantly correlated with consideration, accommodation and ingratiation. The expected relationship with exchange failed to attain significance and was in the opposite direction to the prediction.

Regressions. In order to test the conceptual model and to determine the degree of redundancy or overlap among the variables in it, stepwise multiple regressions were carried out with masculinity, femininity and androgyny (i.e., masculinity · X femininity) as criterion variables and certain leadership, conflict resolution and influence variables (as theoretically specified) as the predictors (see Table 4). For masculinity, of the four variables entered into the equation, only structure and competition were significant predictors. Structure explained 12% of the variance and competition explained an additional 7.6%. Together, after correction for shrinkage (Darlinton, 1968) they accounted for 18% of the variance in masculinity. Rationality and assertiveness were not significant predictors.

insert Table 4 about here

Two of the five variables entered into the equation for femininity were significant predictors. Accommodation explained 13.2% of the variance and consideration explained an additional 3.9%. After correction for shrinkage 15% of the variance in femininity was accounted for by these two variables. Exchange, ingratiation and coalition were not significant predictors of femininity.

Ten variables were entered into the equation for androgyny. Consideration explained 20% of the variance. Competition contributed another 5% and structure and accommodation resulted in 2% more each. Neither collaboration nor any of the POIS variables were significant predictors of androgyny. After correction for shrinkage 26% of the variance in androgyny was explained by the four significant predictors.

ANOVAs on managerial style. Separate 2 (sex) X 2 (masculinity) X 2 (femininity) analyses of variance (see Taylor & Hall, 1982) were performed with each of the leadership, conflict resolution and influence styles as the criterion variables (see Table 5). High masculinity subjects were higher than those low in masculinity on structure, F (1,215) = 17.07, p <.001, consideration, F (1,207) = 31.44, p <.001, competition, F (1,221) = 15.87, p <.001, and collaboration, F (1,218) = 20.48, p <.001. Subjects low in masculinity were more likely than those high in masculinity to use avoidance, F (1,221) = 13.67, p <.001, and accommodation, F (1,220) = 7.98, p < .005. High femininity subjects reported greater use of consideration, F (1,207) = 14.21, p <.001, and accommodation, F (1,220) = 14.21, p < .001, than those low in femininity.

---

insert Table 5 about here

There were also significant masculinity by femininity interactions on consideration, F (1, 207) = 8.23, p <.005, and accommodation, F (1, 220) = 11.75, p <.001. Androgynous subjects were significantly higher in consideration than were masculine, feminine or undifferentiated subjects, p <.05 (see Figure 2). Masculine subjects scored significantly lower on accommodation than subjects in the other three sex-role categories, p <.001 (see Figure 3).

---

insert Figures 2 and 3 about here

There was a sex by masculinity interaction on upward appeal, F (1,221) = 5.49, p = .02, such that low masculinity females were less likely to use this influence tactic than were low masculinity males, F (1,221) = 6.57, p <.01, or high masculinity females, F (1,221) = 4.23, p <.05 (see Figure 4). Persons high in masculinity reported using rationality more than those low in masculinity, F (1,227) = 9.73, p <.002. There was also a sex by femininity interaction, F (1,227) = 8.16, p <.005, such that males low in femininity were less likely to use rationality than were males high in femininity, F (1,227) = 12.2, p <.005, or females low in femininity, F (1,227) = 6.3, p <.01 (see Figure 5). Finally, there was a sex by masculinity by femininity interaction on exchange, F (1,221) = 9.32, p < .003 (see Figure 6).

---

insert Figures 4, 5, & 6 about here

ANOVAs on managerial effectiveness. There were main effects for masculinity for two aspects of self-reported job satisfaction (see Table 6). Subjects low in masculinity were more satisfied with their work, F (1, 220) = 4.6, p <.05, and their co-workers, F (1, 219) = 5.24, p <.05, than were subjects high in masculinity.

---

insert Table 6 about here

There was a significant sex by masculinity interaction on the task subscale of the job stress scale, F (1,217) = 7.2, p <.01, such that high masculinity males reported the lowest levels of stress whereas high masculinity females reported the highest levels (see Figure 7). There was also a masculinity by femininity interaction on task stress, F (1, 217) = 5.6, p <.05. Feminine subjects reported significantly higher levels of stress than androgynous subjects did, F (1, 217) = 5.7, p <.05 (see Figure 7). Androgyny appeared to protect women in particular from the effects of stress. Androgynous females reported experiencing less stress (M = 23.8) than did women who were either masculine (M = 26) or feminine (M = 25).

---

insert Figure 7 about here

There were main effects for masculinity on all three self-ratings of performance: F (1,221) = 31.22, p <.001 for leadership effectiveness, F (1,221) = 8.7, p <.01 for managerial excellence and F (1,220) = 4.04, p <.05 for subordinate performance, such that persons high in masculinity rated their performance as better than those low in masculinity did. High

femininity subjects also reported greater leadership effectiveness than low femininity subjects did, F (1,221) = 4.33, p <.05. For leadership effectiveness, androgynous subjects rated themselves the highest (M = 4.6) followed by masculine (M = 4.3), feminine (M = 4.1) and undifferentiated (M = 3.95) subjects. Subjects low in masculinity reported having received more promotions, F (1, 221) = 3.8, p <.05 and organizational rewards, F (1,212) = 3.5, p <.06, than those high in masculinity.

Discussion

The results of this study strongly support the contention that biological sex is not an important factor in determining managerial style. This is consistent with a voluminous literature which has found that men and women in similar positions do not differ from one another in either leadership style or effectiveness (Birdsall, 1980; Chapman & Luthans, 1975; Day & Stogdill, 1972; Dobbins & Platz, 1986; Donnell & Hall, 1980; Muldrow & Bayton, 1979; Nieva & Gutek, 1982). Given the weight of the evidence which has accumulated on this point, I would hope that the focus on biological sex which has been so prevalent in the leadership literature will not persist. The erroneous assumption of biopsychological equivalence which equates sex with sex-role orientation has been detrimental to women in management and has resulted in their being automatically relegated to certain roles and excluded from others based on their gender alone.

The results of this study provide empirical evidence for a conceptual synthesis of androgyny, leadership, and conflict resolution theories. As predicted, masculinity was related to a style of leadership high in initiating structure and to a competitive conflict resolution style. Likewise, as hypothesized, femininity was related to consideration and accommodation. However, masculinity also had an effect on consideration so

that contrary to expectation, androgynous subjects were more likely to report using a consideration style of leadership than feminine subjects were. In addition, it was expected that androgyny would be related to a collaborative conflict management style (which requires an integration of concern for self with concern for others). However, collaboration was found to be related only to masculinity and not to femininity.

It should be noted that other characteristics of the data may have acted as confounding factors in producing these results. First, in this sample, as in other similar samples (Schriesheim & Kerr, 1974), initiating structure and consideration were found to be highly intercorrelated. Second, and also consistent with previous literature (Banfield, 1976), this sample was skewed toward high masculinity. Because the median on masculinity was so much higher than that on femininity, the use of a median split procedure to derive categories for analysis of variance resulted in a feminine group in which many of the subjects actually had higher absolute scores on masculinity than they did on femininity. Furthermore, there was a restriction of range on femininity which may have attenuated the effects of this variable (Cook, 1985). Given that this sample appears to be typical of other managerial samples (Banfield, 1976; Motowildo, 1982; Muldrow & Bayton, 1979), these same problems are likely to plague any researcher who attempts to investigate the relationships among these variables in a management setting.

Although the dimensions of instrumentality and expressiveness appear to underlie leadership and conflict resolution styles, their connection with influence styles is less clear. The failure to find the expected relationships between masculinity and femininity and different influence styles is not surprising, however, given the lack of theoretical basis for

the POIS.

It was expected that androgynous persons would be more effective managers (as manifested by higher job satisfaction, lower job stress, and higher self ratings of performance) than subjects in the other sex-role categories. Androgynous managers did report lower job stress than feminine managers. In addition, androgynous subjects saw themselves as the most effective leaders. The remaining effectiveness variables, however, were found to be related only to masculinity and not to femininity. Moreover, the effects of masculinity were not always beneficial. Although, high masculinity subjects rated their own and their subordinates' performance as better than low masculinity subjects did, these ratings may reflect nothing more than a lack of modesty on the part of highly masculine persons. It was the individuals who were low in masculinity who reported higher satisfaction with work and co-workers and more promotions and organizational rewards than did those high in masculinity.

The greater success of the low masculinity as compared to the high masculinity managers in this study is consistent with the body of literature which exists on Type A mangers (Howard, Cunningham & Rechnitzer, 1978). Type A individuals, who have been found to be highly masculine (DeGregario & Carver, 1980), report low job satisfaction and although they are well represented in middle management, they often are not promoted into more senior positions. One of the reasons which has been postulated for this (Howard et. al., 1978) is that they are <u>too</u> competitive and task-oriented. However, because all of the information regarding effectiveness in this study is derived from self-ratings, it should be interpreted with extreme caution until replicated and validated by superior and/or subordinate ratings.

This study found some support for the construct of androgyny in terms of both the additive (for leadership effectiveness and consideration) and the balance (for task stress and consideration) models. It should be noted that very few other studies have found evidence for either androgyny model (Taylor & Hall, 1982). The preponderance of the evidence has been that instrumentality and not expressiveness is related to psychological functioning. Although the most prevalent findings associate masculinity with various indices of psychological well being (Bassoff & Glass, 1982; Taylor & Hall, 1982), a growing number of investigations reinforce the conclusion of this study that high instrumentality can also have detrimental effects. The traditional male role has been shown to have negative consequences for both physical and mental health (David & Brannon, 1976; Pleck, 1976) and its efficacy for organizational effectiveness has also been questioned (Forisha & Goldman, 1981). For instance, "masculine" styles have been found to be self-defeating in problem solving situations which require group process skills (Filley, 1977; Maier & Sashkin, 1971) and in a competitive parchesi game where coalition formation was important (Bond & Vinacke, 1961).

Despite the fact that leadership theories recognize that both task-orientation and social-emotionality are necessary and valuable (Bales, 1951; Flieshman, 1973; Stogdill, 1974), expressive qualities have been given low weight in the determination of leadership (Slater, 1955) and the ideal manager is viewed in terms of masculine attributes (Powell & Butterfield, 1979, 1984). This focus on instrumentality has hampered women managers because they have been stereotyped as lacking in task-oriented skills. Women have been advised that they should adopt masculine qualities if they wish to be successful in management positions (Riger & Galligan, 1980) and much research has demonstrated that women managers actually are high in

masculinity (Banfield, 1976; Baril, et.al., 1987; Fagenson & Horowitz, 1985; Muldrow & Bayton, 1979). Whether this emphasis on task-orientation is invariably good is open to question. Future research needs to address the specific domains in which instrmentality and expressivity are related to effective performance. It is likely that some leadership situations will call for instrumentality and others for expressiveness. Hopefully, this would spur a return to conceptualizing leadership in terms of a dialectical synthesis of task- and social-emotional functions which are seen as complementary and equal in importance.

References

Arkkelin, D. & Simmons, R. (1985). The "good manager": Sex typed, androgynous, or likeable? Sex Roles, 1187-1198.

Bales, R.F. (1951). Interaction process analysis. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Banfield, E.E. (1976). Women in middle management positions: Characteristics, training, leadership style, limitations, rewards, problems. Dissertation Abstracts International, (4-B), 1952-3.

Baril, G.L., Elbert, N., & Mahar-Potter, S. (1987). Sex-role orientation and the success of first line supervisors. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, New York, N.Y.

Bassoff, E.S. & Glass, G.V. (1982). The relationship between sex roles and mental health: A meta-analysis of twenty-six studies. Counselling Psychologist, 10, 105-112.

Bem, S.L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42, 155-162.

Birdsall, P. (1980). A comparative analysis of male and female managerial communication style in two organizations. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 16, 183-197.

Blake R.R. & Mouton, J.S. (1978). The new managerial grid. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing Co.

Bolton, E.B. & Humphreys, L.W. (1977). A training model for women- an androgynous approach. Personnel Journal, 230-234.

Bond, J.R. & Vinacke, W.E. (1961). Coalitions in mixed-sex triads. Sociometry, 24, 61-65.

Chapman, J.B. & Luthans, F. (1975). The female leadership dilemma. Public Personnel Management, 4, 173-179.

Chemers, M.M., Hays, R.B., Rhodenwalt, F. & Wysocki, J.A. (1985). A person-environment analysis of job stress: A contingency model explanation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49, *628-635.*

Cook, E.P. (1985). Psychological androgyny. *Toronto: Pergamon Press.*

Darlington, R.B. (1968). Multiple regression in research and practice. Psychological Bulletin, 9, *161-182.*

David, D. & Brannon, R. (1976). The forty-nine percent majority. *Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.*

Day, D.R. & Stogdill, R.M. (1972). Leader behavior of male and female supervisors: A comparative study. Personnel Psychology, 22, *353-360.*

DeGregario, E. & Carver, C.S. (1980). Type A behavior pattern, sex role orientation and psychological adjustment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39, *286-293.*

Dobbins, G.H. & Platz, S.J. (1986). Sex differences in leadership: How real are they? Academy of management Review, 11, *118-127.*

Donnell, S.M. & Hall, J. (1980). Men and women as managers: A significant case of no significant difference. Organizational Dynamics, Spring, *60-77.*

Fagenson, E.A. & Horowitz, S.V. (1985). "La Difference in organizations: A test of three perspectives. A paper [resented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, CA.

Filley, A.C. (1977). Conflict resolution: The ethic of the good loser. In R.C. Houseman, et.al. (Eds.) Readings in interpersonal and organizational communication. *(3rd Ed.) Boston: Holbrook.*

Fleishman, E.A. (1973). Twenty years of consideration and structure. In E.A. Flieshman & J.G. Hunt (Eds.) Current developments in the study of leadership. *(pp 1-38). Carbondale, Il: Southern Illinois University*

Press.

Forisha, B.L. & Goldman, B.H. (1981). Outsiders on the inside: Women and organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Hinkin, T.R & Schriesheim, C.A. (1986). Influence tactics used by subordinates: A theoretical and empirical analysis and refinement of the Kipnis, Schmidt and Wilkinson subscales. Paper presented at the Academy of Management conference, Chicago, Illinois.

Howard, J., Cunningham, D. & Rechnitzer, P. (1978). Rusting out, burning out, bowing out: Stress and survival on the job. Toronto: Financial Post/Gage.

Kilmann, R.H. & Thomas, K.W. (1977). Developing a forced choice measure of conflict-handling behavior: The MODE instrument. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 37, 309-325.

Kipnis, D., Schmidt, S.M., & Wilkinson, I. (1980). Interorganizational influence tactics: Explorations in getting one's way. Journal of Applied Psychology, 65, 440-452.

Korabik, K. (1981). Androgyny and leadership: An integration. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Women in Psychology, Boston, MA.

Korabik, K. (1982a). Sex-role orientation and leadership style. International Journal of Women's Studies, 5, 328-330.

Korabik, K. (1982b, August). Sex-role orientation and leadership style: Further exploration. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C.

Maier, R. & Sashkin, M. (1973). Specific leader behaviors that promote problem solving. In R.C. Houseman, et.al. (Eds.) Readings in interpersonal organization and communication. (2nd. Ed.) Boston:

Holbrook.

Motowidlo, S.J. (1982). Sex role orientation and behavior in a work setting. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42, 935-945.

Muldrow, T.W. & Bayton, J.A. (1979). Men and women executives and processes related to decision accuracy. Journal of Applied Psychology, 64, 99-106.

Nieva, V. F. & Gutek, B.A. (1982). Women and work : A psychological perspective. New York: Preager.

Nishisato, S. (1980). Analysis of categorical data: Dual scaling and its applications. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Pleck, J.H. (1976). The male sex role: Definitions, problems and sources of change. Journal of Social Issues, 32, 155-164.

Powell, G.N. & Butterfield, D.A. (1979). The "good manager": Masculine or androgynous? Academy of Management Journal, 22, 395-403.

Powell, G.N. & Butterfield, D.A. (1984). If "good managers" are masculine, what are "bad managers"? Sex Roles, 10, 477-484.

Rahim, M.A. (1983). A measure of styles of handing interpersonal conflict. Academy of Management Journal, 26, 368-376.

Riger, S. & Galligan, P. (1980). Women in management: An exploration of competing paradigms. American Psychologist, 35, 902-910.

Sampson, E.E. (1977). Psychology and the American ideal. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35, 767-782.

Sargent, A. (1981). The androgynous manager. New York: AMACOM.

Schriesheim, C. & Kerr, S. (1974). Psychometric properties of the Ohio State Leadership scales. Psychological Bulletin, 81, 756-65.

Shockley-Zalabak, P. (1981). The effects of sex differences on the preference for utilization of conflict styles of managers in a

work setting: An exploratory study. Public Personnel Management Journal, 10, 289-295.

Slater, P.E. (1955).Role differentiation in small groups. American Sociological Review, 20, 300-310.

Smith, P.C., Kendall, L.M., & Hulin, C. L. (1969). The measurement of satisfaction in work and retirement. Chicago: Rand- McNally.

Stogdill, R.M. (1974). Handbook of leadership. New York: Free Press.

Stogdill, R.M. & Coons, A.E. (1957). Leader behavior: Its description and measurement. Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Press.

Taylor, M.C. & Hall, J. A. (1982). Psychological androgyny: Theories, methods, conclusions. Psychological Bulletin, 92, 347-366.

Thomas, K.W. (1976). Conflict and conflict management. In M.D. Dunnett (Ed.) Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Thomas, K.W. & Kilmann, R.H. (1974). Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument. Xicom, Inc.

Table 1

Questionnaire Scales

Variable	Measure	Subscales
sex-role orientation	Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) (Bem, 1974)	Masculinity Femininity
leadership style	Ohio State Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) adapted (Stogdill & Coons, 1957)	Structure Consideration
conflict resolution style	Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument -adapted (T-K) (Thomas & Kilmann, 1974)	Avoidance Accommodation Compromise Competition Collaboration
influence style	Profile of Organizational Influence Strategies (POIS) adapted from (Hinkin & Schriesheim, 1986)	Assertiveness Rationality Coalition Ingratiation Exchange
job satisfaction	Job Description Index (JDI) Smith, Kendall & Hulin, 1969)	Work Co-workers Supervisor Pay Promotion
job stress	Chemers, Hays, Rhodewalt & Wysocki, 1985	Task Subordinate Co-Worker Supervisor
performance	leadership effectiveness managerial excellence subordinate performance promotions organizational rewards	

Table 2

Description of Sample

Variable	Total n = 247	Males n = 121	Females n = 126	t	df	p
yrs. experience	13.8	13.6	12.5	n.s.		
yrs. w. company	19.7	20.6	17.6	2.65	234	.01
yrs. in position	3.6	3.6	2.14	3.11	240	.01
# male subordinates	3.8	4.6	1.5	3.12	238	.01
# female subs.	4.9	2.6	5.5	-2.25	237	.05
masculinity	5.4	5.4	5.3	n.s.		
femininity	4.6	4.5	4.7	3.06	242	.01

Table 3

Relationships Among Variables

	Masculinity	Femininity
Structure	.35 ***	.03
Consideration	.37 ***	.24 ***
Competition	.33 ***	.09
Compromise	-.16 **	.13 *
Collaboration	.34 ***	-.03
Avoidance	-.27 ***	.10
Accommodation	-.18 **	.37 ***
Assertiveness	.11 *	-.15 *
Rationality	.21 ***	.16 **
Coalition	.001	.01
Ingratiation	-.01	.14 *
Exchange	.09	-.10

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$

Table 4

Regressions

Predictor	coef.	R	R^2	R^2 change
Criterion: Masculinity				
Structure	.27	.35	.12	.12
Competition	.27	.44	.2	.076
Rationality	.09	.45	.203	.007
Assertiveness	.02	.45	.204	.0002
Criterion: Femininity				
Accommodation	.31	.36	.132	.132
Consideration	.2	.41	.17	.039
Exchange	-.19	.42	.18	.0095
Ingratiation	.2	.45	.2	.02
Coalition	-.07	.46	.208	.004
Criterion: Androgyny				
Consideration	.3	.44	.2	.2
Competition	.19	.49	.25	.05
Structure	.19	.51	.27	.02
Accommodation	.13	.53	.29	.02
Rationality	.09	.54	.29	.006
Assertiveness	-.05	.54	.29	.002
Ingratiation	.07	.54	.29	.003
Coalition	-.04	.54	.3	.001
Exchange	-.02	.54	.3	.0001
Collaboration	.01	.54	.3	.0001

Table 5

ANOVAs - Managerial Style

Variable	*Source*	*F*	*df*	*p*	
Structure	*masculinity*	*17.07*	*1,215*	*.001*	*Hi>Lo*
Consideration	*masculinity*	*31.44*	*1,207*	*.001*	*Hi>Lo*
	femininity	*14.21*	*1,207*	*.001*	*Hi>Lo*
	masc. X fem.	*8.23*	*1,207*	*.005*	*A>M,F,U*
Competition	*masculinity*	*15.87*	*1,221*	*.001*	*Hi>Lo*
Collaboration	*masculinity*	*20.48*	*1,218*	*.001*	*Hi>Lo*
Avoidance	*masculinity*	*13.67*	*1,221*	*.001*	*Lo>Hi*
Accommodation	*masculinity*	*7.98*	*1,220*	*.005*	*Lo>Hi*
	femininity	*14.21*	*1,220*	*.001*	*Hi>Lo*
	masc. X fem.	*11.75*	*1,220*	*.001*	*A,F,U>M*
Upward Appeal	*sex X masc.*	*5.49*	*1,221*	*.02*	*LoM <LoM* *LoM <HiM*
Rationality	*masculinity*	*9.73*	*1,227*	*.002*	*Hi>Lo*
	sex X fem.	*8.16*	*1,227*	*.005*	*LoF <LoF* *LoF <HiF*
Exchange	*sex X masc X fem*	*9.32*	*1,221*	*.003*	

Table 6

Managerial Effectiveness

Variable	Source	F	df	p	
Work Sat.	masculinity	4.6	1,220	.05	Lo>Hi
Co-Worker Sat.	masculinity	5.24	1,219	.05	Lo>Hi
Task Stress	sex X masc.	7.2	1,217	.01	HiM <LoM &HiM
	masc. X fem.	5.6	1,217	.05	F>A
Leader Effect.	masculinity	31.22	1,221	.001	Hi>Lo
	femininity	4.33	1,221	.05	Hi>Lo
Manag. Excell.	masculinity	8.7	1,221	.01	Hi>Lo
Sub. Perform.	masculinity	4.04	1,220	.05	Hi>Lo
Promotions	masculinity	3.8	1,221	.05	Lo>Hi
Org. Rewards	masculinity	3.5	1,212	.06	Lo>Hi